

EMBEDDING OPERATORS AND BOUNDARY-VALUE PROBLEMS FOR ROUGH DOMAINS

V GOLDSHTEIN* AND A.G. RAMM**

ABSTRACT. In the first part of the paper boundary-value problems are considered under weak assumptions on the smoothness of the domains. We assume nothing about smoothness of the boundary ∂D of a bounded domain D when the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is imposed; we assume boundedness of the embedding $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ when the Neumann boundary condition is imposed; we assume boundedness of the embeddings i_1 and of $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ when the Robin boundary condition is imposed, and, if, in addition, i_1 and i_2 are compact, then the boundary-value problems with the spectral parameter are of Fredholm type. Here i_1 is the embedding of $H^1(D)$ (or $H^1(\tilde{D})$) into $L^2(D)$ ($L^2(\tilde{D})$), and $\tilde{D}$ is such bounded subdomain of the exterior domain $D' := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$ that its boundary consists of two components: ∂D and S , where S is a smooth compact manifold. The space $L^2(\partial D)$ is the L^2 space on ∂D with respect to Hausdorff $(n-1)$ -dimensional measure on ∂D . These results motivate our detailed study of the embedding operators. In the second part of the paper new classes of rough bounded domains D are introduced. The embedding operator from $H^1(D)$ into $L^2(\partial D)$ is compact for these classes of domains. These classes include, in particular, the domains whose boundaries are compact Lipschitz manifolds, but much larger sets of domains are also included in the above classes. Several examples of the classes of rough domains for which the embedding i_2 is compact are given. Applications to scattering by rough obstacles are mentioned.

1. INTRODUCTION

Embedding inequalities are studied in this paper for rough, that is, non-smooth, domains. An essentially self-contained presentation of a method for a study of boundary-value problems for second-order elliptic equations in such domains is developed. The novel points include the usage of the limiting absorption principle for the proof of the existence of solutions and weaker than usual assumptions on the smoothness of the boundary. For brevity of the presentation we consider the boundary-value problems for Laplacian, and the three classical boundary conditions. We study interior and exterior boundary-value problems and obtain the existence results and the Fredholm property under weak assumptions on the smoothness of the boundary. The method we use is applicable for general second-order elliptic equations and for obstacle scattering problems. Elliptic boundary-value problems were studied in numerous books and papers. We mention [GT] and [LU], where many references can be found. In [Maz] embedding theorems for a variety of non-smooth domains have been studied. In [RS] the obstacle scattering problems were studied for non-smooth obstacles. In [Ra] and [R] the boundary-value

THIS WORK WAS SUPPORTED BY THE CENTER OF ADVANCED STUDIES IN MATHEMATICS AT BEN GURION UNIVERSITY

problems and direct and inverse obstacle scattering problems have been studied. In [GR] embedding theorems in some classes of rough domains were studied. The aim of this paper is to continue the studies initiated in [R], [RS] and [GR].

Consider the boundary-value problems

$$(1.1) \quad -\Delta u = F \text{ in } D, \quad F \in L^2(D),$$

$$(1.2) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial D.$$

The boundary conditions can be the Neumann one

$$(1.3) \quad u_N = 0 \text{ on } \partial D,$$

where N is the outer unit normal to ∂D , or the Robin one:

$$(1.4) \quad u_N + h(s)u = 0 \text{ on } \partial D,$$

where $h(s) \geq 0$ is a bounded piecewise-continuous function on ∂D .

We are interested in similar problems in the exterior domain $D' := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$, and we consider the case $n = 3$. The case $n > 3$ can be treated similarly. If $n = 2$ some additional remarks are in order since the fundamental solution in this case changes sign and tends to infinity as $|x - y| := r_{xy} \rightarrow \infty$. If $n = 3$, then $g(x, y) := \frac{1}{4\pi r_{xy}}$, and if $n = 2$, then $g(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{1}{r_{xy}}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $-\Delta g = \delta(x - y)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\delta(x)$ is the delta-function.

Below $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(D) := H^0$, $L_0^2(D)$ is the set of $L^2(D)$ functions with compact support, $L_0^2(D')$ is the set of $L^2(D')$ functions which vanish near infinity, $\mathring{H}^1$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(D)$ in the $H^1 := H^1(D)$ norm $\|u\|_1 := (\int_D (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx)^{1/2}$. We denote $\|u\| := (\int_D |u|^2 dx)^{1/2}$.

If the boundary conditions are non-homogeneous, e.g., $u = f$ on ∂D , then we assume that there exists a function $v \in H^1(D) \cap H_{loc}^2(D)$, $\Delta v \in L^2(D)$, such that $v = f$ on ∂D and consider $w := u - v$. The function w satisfies equation (1.1) with F replaced by $F + \Delta v$, and w satisfies (1.2). Similarly one treats inhomogeneous Neumann and Robin boundary conditions. In the case of inhomogeneous boundary conditions the smoothness assumptions on the boundary ∂D are more restrictive than in the case of the homogeneous boundary conditions.

Let us reformulate the problems (1.1)–(1.4) so that the assumptions on ∂D are minimal.

In the case of the Dirichlet problem (1.1)–(1.2) we use the weak formulation:

u solves (1.1)–(1.2) iff $u \in \mathring{H}^1(D) := \mathring{H}^1$ and

$$(1.5) \quad [u, \phi] := (\nabla u, \nabla \phi) = (F, \phi) \quad \forall \phi \in \mathring{H}^1.$$

The weak formulation (1.5) of the Dirichlet problem (1.1)–(1.2) does not require any smoothness of ∂D .

The weak formulation of the Neumann problem (1.1), (1.3) is:

$$(1.6) \quad [u, \phi] = (F, \phi) \quad \forall \phi \in H^1.$$

An obvious necessary condition on F for (1.6) to hold is

$$(1.7) \quad (F, 1) = 0.$$

Although the statement of the problem (1.6) does not require any smoothness assumption on ∂D , one has to assume that ∂D is smooth enough for the Poincaré-type inequality to hold:

$$(1.8) \quad \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}^1} \|u - m\| \leq c \|\nabla u\|, \quad c = \text{const} > 0,$$

see Remark 2.1 below.

The infimum in (1.8) is attained at $m_0 = \frac{1}{|D|} \int_D u dx$, $|D| := \text{meas } D$, and $(u - m_0, 1) = 0$. If $(u, 1) = 0$, then (1.8) implies $\|u\| \leq c \|\nabla u\|$. The role of this inequality will be clear from the proof of the existence of the solution to (1.6) (see Section 2).

Finally, for the Robin boundary condition the weak formulation of the boundary-value problem (1.1), (1.4) is:

$$(1.9) \quad [u, \phi] + \int_{\partial D} hu \bar{\phi} ds = (F, \phi) \quad \forall \phi \in H^1.$$

For (1.9) to make sense, one has to be able to define u on ∂D . For this reason we assume that the embedding $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ is bounded. We also assume the compactness of i_2 , and this assumption is motivated in the proof of the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (1.9).

Let us formulate our results. We assume that $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, ($n = 3$), is a bounded domain and $F \in L^2(D)$ is compactly supported. This assumption will be relaxed in Remark 3.1.

Theorem 1.1. *The solution $u \in \overset{\circ}{H}^1(D)$ of (1.5) exists and is unique.*

Theorem 1.2. *If D is such that (1.8) holds and F satisfies (1.7), then there exists a solution u to (1.6), and $\{u + c\}$, $c = \text{const}$, is the set of all solutions to (1.6) in H^1 .*

Theorem 1.3. *If D is such that $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ is compact and $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ is bounded, $F \in L_0^2(D)$ and $h \geq 0$ is a piecewise-continuous bounded function on ∂D , $h \not\equiv 0$, then problem (1.9) has a solution in $H^1(D)$ and this solution is unique. If i_1 and i_2 are compact, then the problem*

$$[u, \phi] + \int_{\partial D} hu \bar{\phi} ds - \lambda(u, \phi) = (F, \phi), \quad \lambda = \text{const} \in \mathbb{R}$$

is of Fredholm type.

Similar results are obtained in Section 3 for the boundary-value problems in the exterior domains (Theorem 3.1).

Theorems 1.1-1.3 demonstrate existence of a connection between elliptic boundary problems and compactness of embedding operators for Sobolev spaces. This is a motivation for a detailed study of embedding operators.

In Sections 4 and 5 of the paper we prove some results about compactness of the embedding operator from $H^1(D)$ to $L^2(\partial D)$ for rough bounded domains. First, we prove compactness of the embedding operators for “elementary” domains whose boundaries are Lipschitz manifolds or even Lipschitz manifolds “almost everywhere” (in some special sense). This class of “elementary” domains is larger than the known classes of domains used for embedding theorems.

Using a lemma for the union of “elementary” domains we extend this result to domains of the class Q which consists of the finite unions of the “elementary”

domains. We show by examples that the boundary of a bounded domain of class Q can have countably many connected components (see example 5.7). Another example demonstrate that boundaries of such domains are not necessarily have local presentation as graphs of Lipschitz functions (see example 5.8).

2. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1-1.3

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 1.1] One has

$$(2.1) \quad |[u, \phi]| = |(F, \phi)| \leq \|F\| \|\phi\| \leq c \|F\| \|\varphi\|_1$$

where we have used the inequality

$$(2.2) \quad \|\phi\| \leq c \|\phi\|_1, \quad \phi \in \mathring{H}^1,$$

which holds for any bounded domain, i.e., without any smoothness assumptions on D . Note that the norm $[u, u]^{1/2} := [u]$ is equivalent to H^1 norm on $\mathring{H}^1$: $c_1 \|u\|_1 \leq [u] \leq \|u\|_1$, $c_1 = \text{const} > 0$. Inequality (2.1) shows that (F, ϕ) is a bounded linear functional in $H^1(D)$ so, by the Riesz theorem about linear functionals in a Hilbert space, one has

$$[u, \phi] = [BF, \phi] \quad \forall \phi \in \mathring{H}^1,$$

where B is a bounded linear operator from $L^2(D)$ into $\mathring{H}^1$. Thus $u = BF$ is the unique solution to (1.5). $\square$

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 1.2] If $(F, 1) = 0$, then one may assume that $(\phi, 1) = 0$ because $(F, \phi) = (F, \phi - m)$ and the constant m can be chosen so that $(\phi - m, 1) = 0$ if D is bounded. If D is such that (1.8) holds, then

$$(2.3) \quad |[u, \phi]| = |(F, \phi - m)| \leq \|F\| \inf_m \|\phi - m\| \leq c \|F\| \|\nabla \phi\|.$$

Thus $(F, \phi) = [BF, \phi]$, where $B : L^2(D) \rightarrow H^1$ is a bounded linear operator. Thus $u = BF$ solves (1.6), for any constant m and $u + m$ also solves (1.6) because $[m, \phi] = 0$. If u and v solve (1.6), then $w := u - v$ solves the equation $[w, \phi] = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in H^1$. Take $\phi = w$ and get $[w, w] = \|\nabla w\|^2 = 0$. Thus $\nabla w = 0$ and $w = \text{const}$. Theorem 1.2 is proved. $\square$

Remark 2.1. *Necessary and sufficient conditions on D for (1.8) to hold one can find in [Maz]. Inequality (1.8) is equivalent to the boundedness of the embedding in $i_1 : L_2^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ [Maz, p.169]. By L_2^1 denote the space of functions u such that $\|\nabla u\| < \infty$ is denoted.*

Remark 2.2. *If one wants to study the problem*

$$(2.4) \quad -\Delta u - \lambda u = F, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial D$$

where $\lambda = \text{const}$, and a similar problem with the Neumann boundary condition (1.3) or with the Robin condition (1.4) to be of Fredholm type, then one has to assume the operators B in the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 to be compact in $\mathring{H}^1$ and in H^1 respectively. Originally the operators B were acting from $L^2(D)$ onto $\mathring{H}^1$ and H^1 (respectively in Theorem 1.1 and in Theorem 1.2). Thus, B are defined on $\mathring{H}^1 \subset L^2(D)$ and on $H^1 \subset L^2(D)$ respectively.

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 1.3.] If the embedding $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ is bounded, then

$$(2.5) \quad \left| \int_{\partial D} hu\bar{\phi}ds \right| \leq \sup_{\partial D} |h| \|u\|_{L^2(\partial D)} \|\phi\|_{L^2(\partial D)} \leq c\|\phi\|_1.$$

By Riesz's theorem one gets

$$\int_{\partial D} hu\bar{\phi}ds = (Tu, \phi)_1.$$

Equation (1.9) can be written as

$$(2.6) \quad (Au + Tu - BF, \phi)_1 = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in H^1,$$

where $[u, \phi] = (Au, \phi)_1$, $(F, \phi) = (BF, \phi)_1$. Thus

$$(2.7) \quad Qu - BF := Au + Tu - BF = 0,$$

where A is a bounded linear operator in H^1 , $\|A\| \leq 1$ because $[u, u] \leq (u, u)_1$, $\|B\| \leq 1$ because $|(BF, \phi)_1| = |(F, \phi)| \leq \|F\| \|\phi\| \leq \|F\|_1 \|\phi\|_1$, and T is a bounded operator in H^1 if the embedding operator $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ is bounded. If i_2 is compact, then T is compact in H^1 . The operator $Q := A + T$ is linear, defined on all of H^1 , and bounded. The expression

$$N^2(u) := (Qu, u)_1 = [u, u] + \int_{\partial D} h|u|^2ds$$

defines a norm $N(u)$ equivalent to $\|u\|_1$.

Let us prove this equivalence.

By (2.5) one has $N^2(u) \leq c\|u\|_1^2$. Also

$$\|u\|_1^2 = [u, u] + (u, u) \leq N^2(u) + (u, u) \leq c_1 N^2(u)$$

because

$$\|u\| \leq cN(u),$$

where $c = \text{const} > 0$ stands for various constants independent of u .

Let us prove the inequality $\|u\| \leq cN(u)$.

Assuming that it fails, one finds a sequence $u_n \in H^1$, $\|u_n\| = 1$, such that $\|u_n\| \geq nN(u_n)$, so $N(u_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Thus $\|\nabla u_n\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\int_{\partial D} h|u_n|^2ds \rightarrow 0$. Since $\|u_n\| = 1$ one may assume that $u_n \rightharpoonup v$, where $\rightharpoonup$ denotes weak convergence in $L^2(D)$. If $u_n \rightharpoonup v$ and $\nabla u_n \rightharpoonup 0$, then $\nabla v = 0$, so $v = C = \text{const}$, and

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial D} h|u_n|^2ds = C^2 \int_{\partial D} hds,$$

so $C = 0$. Since the embedding $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ is compact and the sequence u_n is bounded in H^1 , we may assume without loss of generality that u_n converges in $L^2(D)$ to zero. This contradicts the assumption $\|u_n\| = 1$. The inequality is proved.

Thus, the norms $N(u)$ and $\|u\|_1$ are equivalent, the operator Q is positive definite, selfadjoint as an operator in H^1 , and therefore Q has a bounded inverse in H^1 . Thus, equation (2.7) has a unique solution $u = Q^{-1}BF$ in H^1 . The statement of Theorem 1.3 concerning Fredholm's type of problem (1.9) follows from Lemma 2.4 below. Theorem 1.3 is proved $\square$

Remark 2.3. As in Remark 2.2, if B is compact in H^1 , then the problem

$$(2.8) \quad [u, \phi] + \int_{\partial D} hu\bar{\phi}ds = \lambda(u, \phi) + (F, \phi), \quad \lambda = \text{const}$$

is of Fredholm type. This problem can be written as $Au + Tu = \lambda Bu + BF$, or

$$(2.9) \quad u = \lambda Q^{-1}Bu + Q^{-1}BF$$

where the operator $Q^{-1}B$ is compact in H^1 .

Lemma 2.4. The operator B is compact in H^1 if and only if the embedding operator $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ is compact.

Proof. Suppose that the embedding $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ is compact. One has $\|u\|^2 = (Bu, u)_1 = (u, Bu)_1$, so B is a linear positive, symmetric, and bounded operator in H^1 . One has $(u, \phi) = (Bu, \phi)_1$, so $\|Bu\|_1 \leq \|u\| \leq \|u\|_1$, so $\|B\|_{H^1 \rightarrow H^1} \leq 1$. A linear positive, symmetric, bounded operator B , defined on all of H^1 , is self-adjoint. The operator $B^{1/2} > 0$ is well defined, B and $B^{1/2}$ are simultaneously compact, and $\|u\| = \|B^{1/2}u\|_1$. Thus, if j is compact then the inequality $\|u_n\|_1 \leq 1$ implies the existence of a convergent in $L^2(D)$ subsequence, denoted again u_n , so that $B^{1/2}u_n$ converges in H^1 . Thus, $B^{1/2}$ is compact in H^1 and so is B .

Conversely, if B is compact in H^1 so is $B^{1/2}$. Therefore, if u_n is a bounded in H^1 sequence, $\|u_n\|_1 \leq 1$, then $B^{1/2}u_{n_k}$ is a convergent in H^1 sequence. Denote the subsequence u_{n_k} again u_n . Then u_n is a convergent in $H^0 = L^2(D)$ sequence because $\|u_n\| = \|B^{1/2}u_n\|_1$. Therefore i_1 is compact. Lemma 2.4 is proved. $\square$

Remark 2.5. We have used the assumptions $h \geq 0$ and $h \not\equiv 0$ in the proof of Theorem 1.3. If h changes sign on ∂D but the embeddings $i_2 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ and $i_1 : H^1(D) \rightarrow L^2(D)$ are compact, then problem (1.9) is still of Fredholm's type because T is compact in H^1 if i_2 is compact.

3. EXTERIOR BOUNDARY-VALUE PROBLEMS

Consider boundary-value problems (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), (1.4) in the exterior domain $D' = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{D}$. The closure of $H_0^1(D')$ in the norm $\|u\|_1 := \{\int_{D'} (|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) dx\}^{1/2}$ is denoted by $H^1 = H^1(D')$ and $H_0^1(D')$ is the set of functions vanishing near infinity and with finite norm $\|u\|_1 < \infty$. We assume that D is bounded. The weak formulation of the boundary-value problems is given similarly to (1.5), (1.6) and (1.9). The corresponding quadratic forms Dirichlet t_D , Neumann t_N and Robin t_R , where $t_D[u, u] = (\nabla u, \nabla u)$, $u \in \mathring{H}^1(D')$; $t_N[u, u] = (\nabla u, \nabla u)$, $u \in H^1(D')$; $t_R[u, u] = (\nabla u, \nabla u) + \langle hu, u \rangle$, $u \in H^1(D')$, $\langle u, v \rangle := \int_{\partial D} u\bar{v}ds$, $0 \leq h \leq c$, are nonnegative, symmetric and closable. Here and below, $c > 0$ stands for various constants. Nonnegativity and symmetry of the above forms are obvious.

Let us prove their closability.

By definition, a quadratic form $t[u, u]$ bounded from below, i.e., $t[u, u] > -m(u, u)$, $m = \text{const}$, and densely defined in the Hilbert space $H = L^2(D')$, is closable if $t[u_n - u_m, u_n - u_m] \xrightarrow{n, m \rightarrow \infty} 0$ and $u_n \xrightarrow{H} 0$ imply $t[u_n, u_n] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. The closure of the domain $D[t]$ of the closable quadratic form in the norm $[u] := \{t[u, u] + (m+1)(u, u)\}^{1/2}$ is a Hilbert space $H_t \subset H$ densely embedded in H . The quadratic form $t[u, u]$ is defined on H_t and this form with the domain of definition H_t is closed.

To prove closability, consider, for example, t_D , and assume $u_n \xrightarrow{H} 0$ and $(\nabla u_n - \nabla u_m, \nabla u_n - \nabla u_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\nabla u_n \xrightarrow{H} f$, and

$$(3.1) \quad (f, \phi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\nabla u_n, \phi) = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n, \nabla \phi) = 0, \quad \forall \phi \in C_0^\infty.$$

Thus $f = 0$, so t_D is closable. Similarly one checks that t_N and t_R are closable. Let us denote by $H_{2,2}^1(D')$ the completion of $C(\bar{D}') \cap C^\infty(D') \cap H_0^1(D')$ in the norm $\|u\| := \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(D')}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\partial D)}^2 \right)^{1/2}$.

For an arbitrary open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with finite volume ($|D| < \infty$, where $|D| := \text{meas } D$ is the volume of D) the inequality

$$(3.2) \quad \|u\|_{L^3(D)} \leq (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(D)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\partial D)})$$

holds, and the embedding operator $i : H_{2,2}^1(D) \rightarrow L^q(D)$ is compact if $q < 3$ and $|D| < \infty$ ([Maz, p.258]).

Consider the closed symmetric forms t_D , t_N and t_R . Each of these forms define a unique selfadjoint operator A in $H = L^2(D')$, $D(A) \subset H^1(D') \subset H$, $(Au, v) = t[u, v]$, $u \in D(A)$, $v \in D[t]$, $A = A_D$, $A = A_N$, and $A = A_R$, respectively.

Let $L_{2,a} := L^2(D', (1 + |x|)^{-a})$, $a > 1$, $\|u\|_{L_{2,a}}^2 = \int_{D'} \frac{|u|^2 dx}{(1+|x|)^a}$ and L_0^2 be the set of $L^2(D')$ functions vanishing near infinity.

Fix a bounded domain $\tilde{D} \subset D'$ whose boundary consists on two parts: ∂D and a smooth compact manifold S . Assume that $i'_1 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ and $i'_2 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ are compact. This assumption depends only on the boundary ∂D and does not depend on the choice of the domain $\tilde{D} \subset D'$, as long as S is smooth.

The following theorem holds:

Theorem 3.1. *For any $F \in L_0^2$, each of the boundary-value problems:*

$$(3.3) \quad A_i u = F, \quad i = D, N \text{ or } R, \quad A_i u = -\Delta u,$$

has a solution $u = \lim_{0 < \epsilon \rightarrow 0} (A - i\epsilon)^{-1} F := (A - i0)^{-1} F$, $u \in H_{loc}^2(D')$, $u \in L_{2,a}$, $a \in (1, 2)$, and this solution is unique.

Similar result holds for the operator $A - k^2$, where $k = \text{const} > 0$, in which case the solution u satisfies the radiation condition at infinity:

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|s|=r} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} - iku \right|^2 ds = 0.$$

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 3.1] *Uniqueness.* If $k = 0$, then the uniqueness of the solution to (3.3) with the mentioned in Theorem 3.1 properties follows from the maximum principle. If $k > 0$, then the uniqueness is established with the help of the radiation condition as it was done in [R], p.230.

Since $A = A_i$ is selfadjoint, the equation

$$(3.5) \quad (A - i\varepsilon)u_\varepsilon = F, \quad \varepsilon = \text{const} > 0, \quad A = -\Delta,$$

has a unique solution $u_\varepsilon \in H = L^2(D')$. Let us prove that if $F \in L_{2,-a}$, then there exists the limit

$$(3.6) \quad u = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u - u_\varepsilon\|_{L_{2,a}} = 0,$$

and u solves (3.3). Thus the limiting absorption principle holds at $\lambda = 0$. Recall that the limiting absorption principle holds at a point λ if the limit

$$u := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (A - \lambda - i\varepsilon)^{-1} F$$

exists in some sense and solves the equation $(A - \lambda)u = F$.

To prove (3.6), assume first that

$$(3.7) \quad \sup_{1 > \varepsilon > 0} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L_{2,a}} \leq c,$$

where $c = \text{const}$ does not depend on ε . If (3.7) holds, then (3.6) holds, as we will prove. Finally, we prove (3.7).

Let us prove that (3.7) implies (3.6). Indeed, (3.7) implies

$$(3.8) \quad \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(D'_R)} \leq c,$$

where $D'_R := D' \cap B_R$, $B_R := \{x : |x| \leq R\}$, and we choose $R > 0$ so that $\text{supp } F \subset B_R$. It follows from (3.8) that there exists a sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $u_n := u_{\varepsilon_n}$ converges weakly: $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $L^2(D'_R)$. From the relation

$$(3.9) \quad t[u_n, \phi] = (F, \phi),$$

where the form t corresponds to the operator A in (3.5) and the choice $\phi = u_n$ is possible, it follows that

$$(3.10) \quad t_i[u_n, u_n] = \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(D')} \leq c, \quad i = D, N$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad t_i[u_n, u_n] = \|\nabla u_n\|_{L^2(D')}^2 + \int_{\partial D} h|u_n|^2 ds \leq c, \quad i = R.$$

From (3.7) and (3.5) it follows that

$$(3.12) \quad \|\Delta u_n\|_{L^2(D'_R)} \leq c.$$

By the known elliptic inequality:

$$(3.13) \quad \|u\|_{H^2(D_1)} \leq c(D_1, D_2) (\|\Delta u\|_{L^2(D_2)} + \|u\|_{L^2(D_2)}), \quad D_1 \Subset D_2,$$

where H^2 is the usual Sobolev space, it follows from (3.10) and (3.8) that

$$(3.14) \quad \|u_n\|_{H^2(D_1)} \leq c,$$

where $D_1 \Subset D'$ is any bounded strictly inner subdomain of D' . By the embedding theorem, it follows that there exists a u such that

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{H^1(D_1)} = 0, \quad D_1 \Subset D'.$$

Here and below we often use a sequence or a subsequence denoted by the same symbol, say u_n , without repeating it each time. In all cases when this is used, the limit of any subsequence is the same and so the sequence converges to this limit as well.

From (3.15) and (3.5) it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Delta u_n - \Delta u\| = 0$, and by (3.13) one concludes

$$(3.16) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{H^2(D_1)} = 0, \quad D_1 \Subset D'.$$

Passing to the limit in (3.5) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ one gets equation (3.3) for u in D' . From (3.10) or (3.11) it follows that

$$(3.17) \quad u_n \xrightarrow{H^1(D'_R)} u \text{ for any } R > 0.$$

Outside the ball B_R one has the equation

$$(3.18) \quad -\Delta u_n - i\varepsilon_n u_n = 0 \text{ in } B'_R := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_R}, \quad u_n(\infty) = 0,$$

and, by Green's formula, one gets

$$(3.19) \quad u_n(x) = \int_{S_R} \left(g_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial N} - u_n \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial N} \right) ds, \quad x \in B'_R, \quad S_R := \{s : |s| = R\},$$

where N is the outer normal to S_R and $g_n = \frac{e^{\gamma \sqrt{\varepsilon_n} |x-y|}}{4\pi |x-y|}$, $\gamma := \frac{-1+i}{\sqrt{2}}$.

By (3.16) and the embedding theorem, one has

$$(3.20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|u_n - u\|_{L^2(S_R)} + \left\| \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial N} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial N} \right\|_{L^2(S_R)} \right) = 0.$$

Passing to the limit in (3.19) one gets

$$(3.21) \quad u(x) = \int_{S_R} \left(g \frac{\partial u}{\partial N} - u \frac{\partial g}{\partial N} \right) ds, \quad x \in B'_R, \quad g := \frac{1}{4\pi |x-y|}.$$

Thus

$$(3.22) \quad |u(x)| \leq \frac{c}{|x|}, \quad x \in B'_R,$$

and $u_n(x)$ satisfies (3.22) with a constant c independent of n .

Let $\tilde{D}$ be a subdomain of D' whose boundary has two parts: ∂D and a smooth compact manifold S .

If the Dirichlet condition is imposed, then the embedding $i' : \mathring{H}^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ is compact for any bounded domain D . If the Neumann condition is imposed, then the compactness of the embedding $i'_1 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ imposes some restriction on the smoothness of ∂D , this embedding operator is not compact for some open bounded sets D . This restriction is weak: it is satisfied for any extension domain. If the Robin condition is imposed, then we use compactness of the operators $i'_1 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ and $i'_2 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\partial \tilde{D})$ for passing to the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(\nabla u_n, \nabla u_n) + \langle h u_n, u_n \rangle] = (\nabla u, \nabla u) + \langle h u, u \rangle.$$

If the embedding operator $i'_1 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ is compact, then (3.10), (3.15) and (3.22) imply the following three conclusions:

$$(3.23) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{L^2(D'_R)} = 0, \quad \forall R < \infty,$$

$$(3.24) \quad u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H^1(D'_R),$$

$$(3.25) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n - u\|_{L_{2,a}} = 0.$$

Note that (3.25) follows from (3.23) and (3.22) if $a > 1$. Indeed,

$$\int_{|x| > R} \frac{|u_n - u|^2 dx}{(1 + |x|)^{1+a}} \leq c \int_{|x| \geq R} \frac{dx}{(1 + |x|)^{1+a} |x|^2} \leq \frac{c}{R^a}.$$

For an arbitrary small $\delta > 0$, one can choose R so that $\frac{c}{R^a} < \delta$ and fix such an R . For a fixed R one takes n sufficiently large and use (3.23) to get

$$\int_{D'_R} \frac{|u_n - u|^2 dx}{(1 + |x|)^{1+a}} < \delta.$$

This implies (3.25).

The limit u solves problem (3.3). We have already proved uniqueness of its solution. therefore not only the subsequence u_n converges to u , but also $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We have proved that (3.7) implies (3.6).

To complete the proof of the existence of the solution to (3.3) one has to prove (3.7). Suppose (3.7) is wrong. Then there is a sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $\|u_{\varepsilon_n}\|_{L_{2,a}} := \|u_n\|_{L_{2,a}} \rightarrow \infty$. Let $v_n := \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|_{2,a}}$. Then

$$(3.26) \quad \|v_n\|_{2,a} = 1$$

$$(3.27) \quad Av_n - i\varepsilon_n v_n = \frac{F}{\|u_n\|_{2,a}}.$$

By the above argument, the embedding $j : H^1(D') \rightarrow L_{2,a}(D')$ is compact, and relation (3.26) implies the existence of $v \in L_{2,a}$ such that

$$(3.28) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n - v\|_{2,a} = 0,$$

and

$$(3.29) \quad Av = 0.$$

By the uniqueness result, established above, it follows that $v = 0$. Thus (3.28) implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n\|_{2,a} = 0$. This contradicts to (3.26).

This contradiction proves Theorem 3.1. $\square$

Remark 3.2. *The above argument is valid also for solving the problem*

$$(3.30) \quad A_i u - \lambda u = F, \quad i = D, N, R, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

provided that problem (3.30) with $F = 0$ has only the trivial solution.

One may also weaken the assumption about F . If $F \in L_{2,-1}$, then (3.21) should be replaced by

$$(3.31) \quad u(x) = \int_{S_R} \left(g \frac{\partial u}{\partial N} - u \frac{\partial g}{\partial N} \right) ds - \int_{B'_R} g(x, y) F(y) dy.$$

If $a > 3$, then, using Cauchy inequality, one gets:

$$(3.32) \quad \left| \int_{B'_R} g(x, y) F dy \right|^2 \leq c \int_{B'_R} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^2 (1 + |y|)^a} \int_{B'_R} |F|^2 (1 + |y|)^a dy \leq \frac{c}{|x|^2},$$

for large $|x|$, so that (3.22) holds if $F \in L_{2,-a}$, $a > 3$. The rest of the argument is unchanged.

Remark 3.3. *We want to emphasize that the assumptions on the smoothness of the boundary ∂D under which we have proved existence and uniqueness of the solutions to boundary-value problems are weaker than the usual assumptions. Namely, for the Dirichlet condition $u = 0$ on ∂D no assumptions, except boundedness of D , are used, for the Neumann condition $u_N = 0$ on ∂D only compactness of the embedding*

operator $i'_1 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\tilde{D})$ is used, and for the Robin boundary condition $u_N + hu = 0$ on ∂D , $0 \leq h \leq c$, compactness of i'_1 and of $i'_2 : H^1(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow L^2(\partial D)$ is used.

Our arguments can be applied for a study of the boundary-value problems for second-order formally selfadjoint elliptic operators and for nonselfadjoint sectorial second-order elliptic operators. In [Kat] one finds the theory of sectorial operators and the corresponding sectorial sesquilinear forms.

4. QUASISOMETRICAL MAPPINGS

The main purpose of this section is to study boundary behavior of quasiisometrical homeomorphisms.

4.1. Definitions and main properties. Let us start with some definitions.

Definition 4.1. (*Quasiisometrical homeomorphisms*) Let A and B be two subsets of R^n . A homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is Q -quasiisometrical if for any point $x \in A$ there exists such a ball $B(x, r)$ that

$$(4.1) \quad Q^{-1}|y - z| \leq |\varphi(y) - \varphi(z)| \leq Q|y - z|$$

for any $y, z \in B(x, r) \cap A$. Here the constant $Q > 0$ does not depend on the choice of $x \in A$, but the radius r may depend on x .

Obviously the inverse homeomorphism $\varphi^{-1} : A \rightarrow B$ is also Q -quasiisometrical. A homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is a quasiisometrical homeomorphism if it is a Q -quasiisometrical one for some Q . Sets A and B are quasiisometrically equivalent if there exists a quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$.

Definition 4.2. (*Lipschitz Manifolds*) A set $M \subset R^n$ is an m -dimensional Q -lipschitz manifold if for any point $a \in M$ there exists a Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi_a : B(0, 1) \rightarrow R^n$ such that $\varphi(0) = a$ and $\varphi(B(0, 1) \cap R^m) \subset M$. Here $R^m := \{x \in R^n : x_{m+1} = \dots = x_n = 0\}$.

We are interested in compact lipschitz manifolds that are boundaries of domains in R^n and/or in $(n - 1)$ -dimensional lipschitz manifolds that are dense subsets of boundaries in the sense of $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure H^{n-1} .

Definition 4.3. (*Class L*) We call a bounded domain $U \subset R^n$ a domain of class L if:

1. There exist a bounded smooth domain $V \subset R^n$ and a quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : V \rightarrow U$;
2. The boundary ∂U of U is a $(n - 1)$ -dimensional lipschitz manifold.

The following proposition is well known and will be useful for a study of domains of class L and boundary behavior of quasiisometrical homeomorphisms.

Proposition 4.4. *Let A and B be two subsets of R^n . A homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is Q -quasiisometrical if and only if for any point $a \in A$ the following inequality holds:*

$$Q^{-1} \leq \liminf_{x \rightarrow a, x \in A} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(a)|}{|x - a|} \leq \limsup_{x \rightarrow a, x \in A} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(a)|}{|x - a|} \leq Q.$$

Here the constant $Q > 0$ does not depend on the choice of $a \in U$.

This proposition is a motivation for the following definition.

Definition 4.5. (*Quasilipschitz mappings*) Let A be a set in R^n . A mapping $\varphi : A \rightarrow R^m$ is Q -quasilipschitz if for any $a \in A$ one has:

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow a, x \in A} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(a)|}{|x - a|} \leq Q$$

Here the constant $Q > 0$ does not depend on the choice of $a \in A$.

A mapping is quasilipschitz if it is Q -quasilipschitz for some Q .

A homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is a quasiisometrical homeomorphism iff φ and φ^{-1} are quasilipschitz.

By definition any quasilipschitz mapping is a locally lipschitz one. A restriction of a Q -quasilipschitz mapping on any subset $B \subset A$ is a quasilipschitz mapping also.

4.2. Interior metric and boundary metrics. Suppose A is a linearly connected set in R^n . An interior metric μ_A on A can be defined by the following way:

Definition 4.6. For any $x, y \in A$

$$\mu_A(x, y) = \inf_{\gamma_{x,y}} l(\gamma_{x,y}),$$

where $\gamma_{x,y} : [0, 1] \rightarrow A$, $\gamma_{x,y}(0) = x$, $\gamma_{x,y}(1) = y$ is a rectifiable curve and $l(\gamma_{x,y})$ is length of $\gamma_{x,y}$.

As follows from Definition 4.5 a Q -quasilipschitz mapping can change the length of a rectifiable curve by a factor Q at most. Hence a Q -quasilipschitz mapping $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ of a linearly connected set A onto a linearly connected set B is a lipschitz mapping of the metric space (A, μ_A) onto the metric space (B, μ_B) . Any Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is a bilipschitz homeomorphism of the metric space (A, μ_A) onto the metric space (B, μ_B) .

Because any domain U of the class L is quasiisometrically equivalent to a smooth bounded domain and for a smooth bounded domain the interior metric is equivalent to the Euclidian metric, the interior metric μ_U is equivalent to the Euclidian metric for the domain U also. It means that for any domain $U \in L$

$$K^{-1} |x - y| \leq \mu_U(x, y) \leq K |x - y|$$

for any $x, y \in U$. Here a positive constant K does not depend on the choice of the points x, y . Therefore for any bounded domain $U \in L$ any quasilipschitz mapping $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ is a lipschitz mapping $\varphi : (U, \mu_U) \rightarrow R^m$ for the interior metric.

We will use the following definition of locally connected domain $U \in R^n$ that is equivalent to the standard one.

Definition 4.7. Suppose $(x_k \in U), (y_k \in U)$ are two arbitrary convergent sequences such that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_U(x_k, y_k) > 0$. Call a domain $U \in R^n$ locally connected if for any such sequences one has $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k \neq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k$

If a boundary of a bounded domain is a topological manifold then this domain is locally connected. Therefore, domains of the class L are locally connected domains because their boundaries are compact lipschitz manifolds.

Definition 4.8. Let A be a closed linearly connected subset of R^n and $H^{n-1}(A) > 0$. Call the interior metric μ_A a quasieclidean metric almost everywhere if there exists a closed set $Q \subset A$ with $H^{n-1}(Q) = 0$, such that for any point $x \in A \setminus Q$ the following condition holds:

There exists such ball $B(x, r)$ that for any $y, z \in B(x, r)$

$$\frac{1}{K}|y - z| \leq \mu_A(y, z) \leq K|y - z|,$$

where $K = \text{const} > 0$ does not depends on choice y, z and x .

By definition of lipschitz manifolds any domain of the class L is quasieucclidean at any boundary point.

Definition 4.9. Suppose U is a domain in R^n and $x_0, y_0 \in \partial U$. Let us call the following quantity

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}(x_0, y_0) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_{|x - x_0| < \varepsilon, |y - y_0| < \varepsilon} \mu_U(x, y)$$

relative interior boundary metric.

Because boundary of any domain U of the class L is a compact lipschitz manifold, the relative interior boundary metric on ∂U is equivalent to the interior boundary metric on ∂U for such domains. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 4.10. A bounded domain $U \subset R^n$ has an almost quasiisometrical boundary if $H^{n-1}(\partial U) < \infty$ and there exists a closed set $A \in \partial U$ with $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$ such that for any point $x_0 \in \partial U \setminus A$ the following condition holds:

There exists a ball $B(x_0, r)$, $B(x_0, r) \cap A = \emptyset$, such that for any $x, y \in \partial U \cap B(x_0, r)$ one has:

$$\frac{1}{K}\mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \leq \widetilde{\mu_{\partial U}}(x, y) \leq K\mu_{\partial U}(x, y),$$

where $K = \text{const} > 0$ does not depend on the choice of x_0, x and y .

We will use for the two-sided inequalities similar to the above one the following short notation $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim \mu_{\partial U}(x, y)$.

If a domain U has an almost quasiisometric boundary ∂U and this boundary is locally almost quasieucledian then $\mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim |x - y|$ for any $x, y \in \partial U$.

Definition 4.11. We call a bounded domain $U \subset R^n$ an almost quasiisometrical domain if $H^{n-1}(\partial U) < \infty$ and there exists such a closed set $A \in \partial U$, with $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$, that the following condition holds:

There exists a ball $B(x_0, r) \cap A = \emptyset$ such that for any $x, y \in \partial U \cap B(x_0, r)$ one has:

$$\mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim \widetilde{m_{\partial U}}(x, y) \sim |x - y|.$$

By the extension theorem for lipschitz mappings any quasiisometrical homeomorphism φ of a smooth bounded domain in R^n onto a domain V in R^n has a lipschitz extension $\tilde{\psi}$ onto R^n . Denote by ψ the restriction of a lipschitz extension $\tilde{\psi}$ on ∂U . By continuity, the extension ψ is unique.

Definition 4.12. Let U be a smooth domain in R^n and V be a domain in R^n such that $H^{n-1}(\partial V) < \infty$. A quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ has N^{-1} -property on the boundary if for any $A \in \partial V$ with $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$ one has $H^{n-1}(\psi^{-1}(A)) = 0$.

The definition makes sense because the extension ψ of a quasiisometrical homeomorphism φ on ∂U is unique.

Definition 4.13. (*Class QI*) Let us call a bounded domain V a domain of class QI if:

- 1) There exists a quasisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ of a smooth bounded domain U onto the domain V that has the N^{-1} -property on the boundary.
- 2) there exists such a closed set $A \in \partial V$, $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$, that $\partial V \setminus A$ is a Q -lipschitz manifold for some Q ;
- 3) V is a locally connected almost quasiisometrical domain.

Remark. The class L is a subclass of the class QI .

4.3. Boundary behavior of quasiisometrical homeomorphisms.

Proposition 4.14. *Suppose a Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ maps a smooth bounded domain U onto a locally connected domain V . Then there exists an extension ψ of φ on ∂U such that $\psi(\partial U) = \partial V$ and the mapping $\psi|_{\partial U}$ is a lipshitz mapping of multiplicity one.*

Proof. Because U is a smooth domain, φ is a lipschitz mapping. By the extension theorem for lipschitz mappings there exists a Q -lipschitz extension $\tilde{\psi} : R^n \rightarrow R^n$ of φ . This extension is not necessarily a quasiisometrical homeomorphism. By continuity of $\tilde{\psi}$ and because $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ is a homeomorphism we have $\tilde{\psi}(\partial U) = \partial V$.

Suppose $\psi := \tilde{\varphi}|_{\partial U}$ has multiplicity more than one. Then there exist two different points $x_0, y_0 \in \partial U$, $x_0 \neq y_0$ such that $\psi(x_0) = \psi(y_0)$. Choose two sequences: $x_k \in U$ and $y_k \in U$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x_0$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = y_0$. Because U is a smooth bounded domain the interior metric μ_U is equivalent to the Euclidean metric, i.e. there exists a positive constant Q such that $\mu_U(x_k, y_k) \geq Q^{-1} |x_k - y_k| \geq Q^{-1} |x_0 - y_0| > 0$ for all sufficiently large k . The homeomorphism $\varphi : (U, \mu_U) \rightarrow (V, \mu_V)$ is a bi-lipschitz homeomorphism. Therefore $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_V(\varphi(x_k), \varphi(y_k)) > 0$. Because U is a locally connected domain $\psi(x_0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_k) \neq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_k) = \psi(y_0)$. This contradiction proves the Proposition. $\square$

For any lipschitz m -dimensional compact manifold $M \subset R^n$ and for any lipschitz mapping $\varphi : M \rightarrow R^n$ the set $\varphi(M)$ is H^m -measurable for the m -dimensional Hausdorff measure H^m and $H^m(\varphi(M)) < \infty$.

The next theorem, dealing with area formulas, is a particular case of the result proved in [AK] and used for domains of the class QI .

Let us start with an abstract version of this theorem.

Definition 4.15. Call a metric space X a H^k -rectifiable metric space if there exists such finite or countable set of lipschitz mappings $\alpha_i : A_i \rightarrow X$ of mesurable sets $A_i \subset R^k$ into X that $H^k(X \setminus \bigcup_j \alpha_j(A_j)) = 0$.

By the definition of the class QI a boundary ∂U of any domain $U \in QI$ is a H^{n-1} -rectifiable metric space.

Our next definition represents an abstract version of Jacobian for H^k -rectifiable metric spaces.

Definition 4.16. Let X and Y be H^k -rectifiable complete metric spaces and $F : X \rightarrow Y$ be a lipschitz mapping. Call the quantity

$$J(x, F) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{H^k(F(B(x, r)))}{H^k(B(x, r))}$$

a formal Jacobian of F at a point x .

Theorem 4.17. *Suppose X and Y are H^k -rectifiable complete metric spaces and $F : X \rightarrow Y$ is a lipschitz mapping of multiplicity one.*

Then

1. *Formal Jacobian $J(x, F)$ exists H^k -almost everywhere;*
2. *The following area formula holds:*

$$\int_X J(x, F) dH^k = \int_{F(X)} dH^k;$$

3. *For any $u \in L^1(Y)$*

$$\int_X u(F(x)) J(x, F) dH^k = \int_{F(X)} u(y) dH^k.$$

Corollary 4.18. *If a domain V belongs to the class QI , and $\varphi : V \rightarrow U$ is a Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism, then $H^{n-1}(\partial U) < \infty$.*

Proof. Any Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : V \rightarrow U$ of a smooth domain $V \in R^n$ onto a domain U of the class QI has a lipschitz extension $\tilde{\psi} : R^n \rightarrow R^n$. By definition of the class QI the domain V is a locally connected domain. Hence by Proposition 4.14 the Q -lipschitz mapping $\psi := \tilde{\psi}|_{\partial V}$ has multiplicity one and $\psi(\partial V) = \partial U$. By Theorem 4.17 $H^{n-1}(\partial U) < \infty$. $\square$

5. QUASIISOMETRICAL HOMEOMORPHISMS AND EMBEDDING OPERATORS.

By Corollary 4.18, $H^{n-1}(\partial V) < \infty$ for any domain $V \in QI$. Therefore we can define Banach space $L^2(\partial V)$ using the Hausdorff measure H^{n-1} .

Proposition 5.1. *Let U be a smooth domain and $V \in QI$. Any Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ that has N^{-1} -property on the boundary induces a bounded composition operator $\psi^* : L^2(\partial V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ by the rule $\psi^*(u) = u \circ \psi$.*

Proof. Denote by m the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure on ∂U and by ψ the extension of ϕ onto ∂U . By Theorem 4.17 for any $u \in L^2(\partial V)$

$$\int_{\partial U} |u(\psi(x))|^2 J(x, \psi) dm = \int_{\partial V} |u(y)|^2 dH^m.$$

Suppose that there exists such a constant $K > 0$ that $J(x, \psi) \geq K^{-1}$ for almost all $x \in \partial U$. Denote by $A \in \partial U$, with $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$, a set of all points for which the previous inequality does not hold. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi^* u\|_{L^2(\partial U)}^2 &= \int_{\partial U \setminus A} |u(\psi(x))|^2 dH^{n-1} = \int_{\partial U \setminus A} |u(\psi(x))|^2 \frac{J(x, \psi)}{J(x, \psi)} dH^{n-1} \leq \\ &K \int_{\partial V \setminus \psi^{-1}(A)} |u(\psi(x))|^2 J(x, \psi) dm = K \|u\|_{L^2(\partial V)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is valid because φ has the N^{-1} -property on the boundary, i.e. $m(\psi^{-1}(A)) = 0$. Therefore $\psi^* : L^2(\partial V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ is a bounded operator and $\|\psi^*\| \leq K$.

To finish the proof we have to demonstrate that $J(x, \psi) \geq K^{-1}$. Remember that any domain of the class QI has an almost quasiisometric boundary.

It means that we can choose such a closed subset $A \subset \partial V$, with $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$, that the following property holds:

For any $x_0 \in \partial V \setminus A$ there exists such a ball $B(x_0, r) \cap A = \emptyset$ that:

1) $B(x_0, r) \cap A = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial V}(x, y) \sim \mu_{\partial V}(x, y) \sim |x - y|$ for any $x, y \in \partial V \cap B(x_0, r)$,

2) $B(x_0, r) \cap \partial V$ is a lipschitz manifold.

Let $B := \psi^{-1}(A)$. Choose a point $z_0 \in \partial U \setminus B$ and such a ball $B(z_0, R)$ that relations $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim \mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim |x - y|$ hold for any $x, y \in \psi(B(z_0, R)) \cap \partial U$. This is possible because U is a smooth domain.

Because φ is a Q -quasiisometric, the length $|\gamma|$ of any curve $\gamma \subset V$ satisfies the estimate:

$$\frac{1}{Q}|\varphi(\gamma)| \leq |\gamma| \leq Q|\varphi(\gamma)|$$

where $|\varphi(\gamma)|$ is the length of the curve $\varphi(\gamma) \in U$. In terms of the relative interior metric $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}$ it means that

$$B_{\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}}(x_0, \frac{1}{Q}R) \subset \psi(B(z_0, R) \cap \partial V) \subset B_{\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}}(x_0, QR)$$

where $x_0 = \psi(z_0)$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim \mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim |x - y|$ for any $x, y \in B_{\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}}(x_0, QR)$. Finally we obtain

$$(5.1) \quad B(x_0, \frac{1}{K}R) \subset \psi(B(z_0, R) \cap \partial V) \subset B(x_0, KR)$$

for some constant K that depends only on Q and constants in relations $\tilde{\mu}_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim \mu_{\partial U}(x, y) \sim |x - y|$.

We have proved the inequality $J_\psi(x) \geq K^{-1}$ almost everywhere on ∂U . $\square$

5.1. Compact embedding operators for rough domains. It is well known that the embedding operator $H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$ is compact for bounded smooth domains.

We will prove compactness of the embedding operator for the class QI . Then we extend the embedding theorem to the domains that are finite unions of the QI -domains. Our proof is based on the following result: a quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ induces a bounded composition operator $\varphi^* : H^1(V) \rightarrow H^1(U)$ by the rule $\varphi^*(u) = u \circ \varphi$ (see, for example [GRe] or [Z]).

Definition 5.2. A domain U is a domain of class Q if it is a finite union of elementary domains of class QI .

Let us use the following result:

Theorem 5.3. (see for example [GRe] or [Z]) Let U and V be domains in R^n . A quasiisometrical homeomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ induces a bounded composition operator $\varphi^* : H^1(V) \Rightarrow H^1(U)$ by the rule $\varphi^*(u) = u \circ \varphi$.

Combining this Theorem with Theorem 5.1, one gets:

Theorem 5.4. If U is a domain of the class QI , then the embedding operator $i_U : H^1(U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ is compact.

Proof. By definition of the class QI there exist a smooth bounded domain V and a quasiisometrical homomorphism $\varphi : V \rightarrow U$. By Proposition 5.1 φ induces a bounded composition operator $\psi^* : L^2(\partial U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial V)$ by the rule $\psi^*(u) = u \circ \psi$. Because the embedding operator $i_U : H^1(U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ is compact and the composition operator $(\varphi^{-1})^* : H^1(V) \rightarrow H^1(U)$, induced by quasiisometrical homeomorphism φ , is bounded the embedding operator $i_V : H^1(V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial V)$, $i_U = (\varphi^{-1})^* \circ i_V \circ (\varphi)^*$ is compact. $\square$

To apply this result for domains of the class Q we need the following lemma:

Lemma 5.5. *If U and V are domains of the class QI , then the embedding operator $H^1(U \cup V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial(U \cup V))$ is compact.*

Proof. By previous proposition operators $i_U : H^1(U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ and $i_V : H^1(V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial V)$ are compact. Choose a sequence $\{w_n\} \subset H^1(U \cup V)$, $\|w_n\|_{H^1(U \cup V)} \leq 1$ for all n . Let $u_n := w_n|_{\partial U}$ and $v_n := w_n|_{\partial V}$. Then $u_n \in L^2(\partial U)$, $v_n \in L^2(\partial V)$, $\|u_n\|_{L^2(\partial U)} \leq \|i_U\|$, $\|v_n\|_{L^2(\partial V)} \leq \|i_V\|$.

Because the embedding operator $H^1(U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ is compact, we can choose a subsequence $\{u_{n_k}\}$ of the sequence $\{u_n\}$ which converges in $L^2(\partial U)$ to a function $u_0 \in L^2(\partial U)$. Because the embedding operator $H^1(V) \rightarrow L^2(\partial V)$ is also compact we can choose a subsequence $\{v_{n_{k_m}}\}$ of the sequence $\{v_{n_k}\}$ which converges in $L^2(\partial V)$ to a function $v_0 \in L^2(\partial V)$. One has: $u_0 = v_0$ almost everywhere in $\partial U \cap \partial V$ and the function $w_0(x)$ which is defined as $w_0(x) := u_0(x)$ on $\partial U \cap \partial(U \cup V)$ and $w_0(x) := v_0(x)$ on $\partial V \cap \partial(U \cup V)$ belongs to $L^2(\partial(U \cup V))$.

Hence

$$\|w_{n_{k_m}} - w_0\|_{L^2(\partial(U \cup V))} \leq \|u_{n_{k_m}} - u_0\|_{L^2(\partial U)} + \|v_{n_{k_m}} - v_0\|_{L^2(\partial V)}.$$

Therefore $\|w_{n_{k_m}} - w_0\|_{L^2(\partial(U \cup V))} \rightarrow 0$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

From Theorem 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 the main result of this section follows immediately:

Theorem 5.6. *If a domain Ω belongs to class Q then the embedding operator $H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$ is compact.*

Proof. Let U be an elementary domain of class Q . By Theorem 5.4 the embedding operator $i_U : H^1(U) \rightarrow L^2(\partial U)$ is compact.

Because any domain V of class Q is a finite union of domains of class QI the result follows from Lemma 5.5. $\square$

5.2. Examples. Example 5.7 shows that a domain of the class Q can have infinite number of connected boundary components.

Example 5.7. Take two domains:

1. Let domain U is a union of rectangles $P_k := \{(x_1, x_2) : |x_1 - 2^{-k}| < 2^{-k-2}; 0 \leq x_2 < 2^{-k-2}\}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and the square $S := (0, 1) \times (-1, 0)$;
2. , $V := \{(x_1, x_2) : 0 < x_1 < 1; 10^{-1}x_1 \leq x_2 < 1\}$.

In the book of V.Mazyra [Maz] it was proved that U is a domain of the class L . It is obvious that V is also a domain of the class L . Therefore $\Omega = U \cup V$ is a domain of class Q . By Theorem 5.6 the embedding operator $H^1(\Omega) \Rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$ is compact.

The boundary $\partial\Omega$ of the plane domain Ω contains countably many connected components that are boundaries of domains

$$S_k := \{(x_1, x_2) : |x_1 - 2^{-k}| < 2^{-k-2}; 10^{-1}x_1 \leq x_2 < 2^{-k-2}\}.$$

The boundary of the rectangle $S_0 := \{(x_1, x_2) : 0 < x_1 < 1; -1 \leq x_2 < 1\}$ is also a large connected component of $\partial\Omega$.

Any neighborhood of the point $\{0, 0\}$ contains countably many connected components of $\partial\Omega$ and therefore can not be represented as a graph of any continuous function.

Higher-dimensional examples can be constructed using the rotation of the plane domain Ω around x_1 -axis.

Next, we show that the class QI contains simply-connected domains with non-trivial singularities.

Let us describe first a construction of a new quasiisometrical homeomorphism using a given one. Suppose that $S_k(x) = kx$ is a similarity transformation (which is called below a similarity) of R^n with the similarity coefficient $k > 0$, $S_{k_1}(x) = k_1x$ is another similarity and $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$ is a Q -quasiisometrical homeomorphism. Then a composition $\psi := S_k \circ \varphi \circ S_{k_1}$ is a k_1kQ -quasiisometrical homeomorphism.

This remark was used in [GR] for construction of an example of a domain with “spiral” boundary which is quasiisometrically equivalent to a cube. At “the spiral vertex” the boundary of the “spiral” domain is not a graph of any lipschitz function. Here we will show that the “spiral” domain belongs to the class QI . Let us recall the example from [GR].

Example 5.8. We can start with the triangle $T := \{(s, t) : 0 < s < 1, s < t < 2s\}$ because T is quasiisometrically equivalent to the unit square $Q_2 = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$. Hence we need to construct only a quasiisometrical homeomorphism φ_0 from T into R^2 .

Let (ρ, θ) be polar coordinates in the plane. Define first a mapping $\varphi : R_+^2 \rightarrow R^2$ as follows: $\varphi(s, t) = (\rho(s, t), \theta(s, t))$, $\rho(s, t) = s$, $\theta(s, t) = 2\pi \ln \frac{t}{s}$. Here $R_+^2 := \{(s, t) : 0 < s < \infty, 0 < t < \infty\}$. An inverse mapping can be calculated easily: $\varphi^{-1}(\rho, \theta) = (s(\rho, \theta), t(\rho, \theta))$, $s(\rho, \theta) = \rho$, $t(\rho, \theta) = \rho^2 e^{\frac{\theta}{2\pi}}$. Therefore φ and $\varphi_0 := \varphi|T$ are diffeomorphisms.

The image of the ray $t = ks$, $s > 0, k > 0$, is the logarithmic spiral $\rho = k \exp(-\frac{\theta}{2\pi})$. Hence the image $S := \varphi(T) = \varphi_0(T)$ is an “elementary spiral” plane domain, because ∂T is a union of two logarithmic spirals $\rho = \exp(-\frac{\theta}{2\pi})$, $\rho = 2 \exp(-\frac{\theta}{2\pi})$ and the segment of the circle $\rho = 1$.

The domain T is a union of countably many subdomains $T_n := \{(s, t) : e^{-(n+1)} < s < e^{-(n-1)}, s < t < 2s\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. On the first domain T_1 the diffeomorphism $\varphi_1 := \varphi|T_1$ is Q -quasiisometrical, because φ_1 is the restriction on T_1 of a diffeomorphism φ defined in R_+^2 and $\overline{T_1} \subset R_+^2$. We do not calculate the number Q .

In [GR] it was proven that any diffeomorphism $\varphi_n := \varphi|T_n$ that is the composition $\varphi_n = S_{e^{-(n-1)}} \circ \varphi_1 \circ S_{e^{n-1}}$ of similarities $S_{e^{-(n-1)}}$, $S_{e^{n-1}}$ and the Q -quasiisometrical diffeomorphism φ_1 is Q -quasiisometrical. Therefore the diffeomorphism φ_0 is also Q -quasiisometrical, and the “elementary spiral” domain $U = \varphi_0(T)$ is quasiisometrically equivalent to the unit square.

By construction, the boundary of the domain $U := \varphi(T)$ is smooth at any point except the point $\{0\}$. This domain is a locally connected domain. The quasiisometrical homeomorphism φ has N^{-1} property because all the homeomorphisms φ_n have this property. Except the point $\{0\}$ the boundary ∂U is a Q -lipschitz manifold. All other properties of QI -domains are subject of simple direct calculations. Therefore the domain T is a QI -domain.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this section we combine the results about elliptic boundary problems with these about embedding operators.

The first result is a formulation of Theorem 1.3 for a large concrete class of rough domains. This result follows immediately from Theorem 1.3, Theorem 3.11 [GR] and Theorem 5.6.

Theorem 6.1. *If D is a domain of the class Q , $F \in L_0^2(D)$, and $h \geq 0$ is a piecewise-continuous bounded function on ∂D , $h \not\equiv 0$, then problem (1.9) has a solution in $H^1(D)$, this solution is unique, and the problem*

$$[u, \phi] + \int_{\partial D} hu\bar{\phi}ds - \lambda(u, \phi) = (F, \phi), \quad \lambda = \text{const} \in \mathbb{R}$$

is of Fredholm type.

The next result is a formulation of Theorem 3.1 for a large class of rough exterior domains D' .

Fix a bounded domain $\tilde{D} \subset D'$ whose boundary consists of two parts ∂D and a smooth compact manifold S . Assume that $\tilde{D}$ belongs to the class Q . By the definition of the class Q , this assumption holds for any choice of $\tilde{D}$ because for the smooth component S the conditions defining the class Q hold.

Then the following Theorem follows immediately from Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.11 [GR] and Theorem 5.6.

Theorem 6.2. *For any $F \in L_0^2$, each of the boundary-value problems:*

$$(6.1) \quad A_i u = F, \quad i = D, N \text{ or } R, \quad A_i u = -\Delta u,$$

has a solution $u = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} (A - i\epsilon)^{-1} F := (A - i0)^{-1} F$, $u \in H_{loc}^2(D')$, $u \in L_{2,a}$, $a \in (1, 2)$, and this solution is unique.

REFERENCES

- [AK] Ambrosio L., Kirchhennheim B., Rectifiable sets in metric and Banach spaces, Math. Ann., 318, 2000, p.527-555.
- [GT] D.Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Springer, Berlin, 2001
- [GR] V.Goldshtein, A.G.Ramm, Embedding operators for rough domains, Math Ineq. and Applications, 4, N1, (2001) 127-141.
- [GRé] V.M.Gol'dshtein, Yu.G. Reshetnyak, Quasiconformal Mappings and Sobolev Spaces, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1990.
- [GGR] V. Gol'dshtein, L.Gurov, A.Romanov, Homeomorphisms that induce monomorphisms of Sobolev spaces, Isr. Journ. of Math., 91,1995,31-60.
- [EH] W.Evans, D.Harris, Sobolev embeddings for generalized ridged domains, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., 54, N3, (1987), 141-175.
- [Kat] T.Kato, Perturbation theory for linear operators, Springer, New York, 1984
- [LU] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, N.N. Ural'tseva, Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations, Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [Maz] V. Maz'ja, Sobolev spaces, Springer, Berlin, 1985
- [Ra] A.G.Ramm, Scattering by obstacles, D.Reidel, Dordrecht, 1986.
- [R] A.G.Ramm, Inverse problems, Springer, New York, 2004.
- [RS] A.G.Ramm, M.Sammartino, Existence and uniqueness of the scattering solutions in the exterior of rough domains, in the book "Operator theory and its applications", Amer. Math. Soc., Fields Institute Communications, vol.25, pp.457-472, Providence, RI, 2000. (Editors A.G.Ramm, P.Shivakumar, A.Strauss)
- [Z] W.P.Ziemer, Weakly Differentiable Functions, Springer Verlag, 1989

*MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, BEN GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, P.O.Box 653, BEER SHEVA, 84105, ISRAEL, VLADIMIR@BGUMAIL.BGU.AC.IL

^{**}MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KS 66506-2602,
USA, RAMM@MATH.KSU.EDU